	Case 1:13-cr-10048-FDS Document 247 Filed 01/07/16 Page 1 of 40	
	Case 1.15 ci 10040 i D5 Document 247 i nea 01/07/10 i age 1 0/40	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS	
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
5	Plaintiff,)	
6) No. 13-10048-FDS vs.	
7)	
8	KING BELIN,) Defendant.)	
9		
10	BEFORE: THE HONORABLE F. DENNIS SAYLOR, IV	
11		
12	SENTENCING	
13		
14		
15	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse	
16	Courtroom No. 2 One Courthouse Way	
17	Boston, MA 02210	
18	September 29, 2015	
19	2:00 p.m.	
20		
21		
22		
23	Valerie A. O'Hara Official Court Reporter	
24	John Joseph Moakley United States Courthouse One Courthouse Way, Room 3204	
25	Boston, MA 02210 E-mail: vaohara@gmail.com	

```
Case 1:13-cr-10048-FDS Document 247 Filed 01/07/16 Page 2 of 40
                                                                         2
 1
      APPEARANCES:
 2
      For The United States:
           United States Attorney's Office, by JOHN A. WORTMANN, JR.,
 3
      ESQ., 1 Courthouse Way, Suite 9200, Boston, Massachusetts
 4
      02110;
      For the Defendant:
 5
 6
           PAUL J. GARRITY, ESQ., 14 Londonderry Road,
      Londonderry, New Hampshire 03053.
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 PROCEEDINGS THE CLERK: All rise. Thank you. Please be seated. 2. Court is now in session in the matter of United States vs. 3 King Belin, Criminal Matter Number 13-10048. 4 Will counsel please identify themselves for the record. 7 MR. WORTMANN: Good afternoon, your Honor, John Wortmann for the United States. 8 9 MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, good afternoon, Paul Garrity 02:02PM 10 for King Belin. 11 THE COURT: Good afternoon. This is the sentencing of 12 King Belin. I've received and read the pre-sentence report 1.3 through its latest iteration, which is September 18th, the 14 defendant's original sentencing memorandum filed on April 23rd 1.5 and motion for a nonquideline sentence filed September 28th as 16 well as the government's original sentencing memorandum from 17 last March and the supplemental memorandum filed on 18 September 23rd. 19 To my knowledge, no other materials have been 02:03PM 20 submitted to the Court. Is there anything else I should have 21 seen that I have not, Mr. Garrity? 22 MR. GARRITY: Not in writing, but Mr. Belin has asked 23 me to raise some objections to the PSR report. 24 THE COURT: All right. It's going to need some corrections, I think, in light of the government's position 25

1 anyway, but Mr. Wortmann.

2.

3

4

6

8

9

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:05PM 20

02:04PM 10

MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, the only other thing, just a notification that we'd be seeking a nonquideline sentence.

THE COURT: Yes, okay. All right. Mr. Garrity, I know you've reviewed the PSR. Have you gone over it with Mr. Belin?

MR. GARRITY: I have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that correct, Mr. Belin?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. My understanding as to the PSR and what otherwise would have been a significantly higher guideline range is that the government is taking the position that all four offenses described in the PSR at paragraphs 34, 35, 36 and 38 for resisting arrest or assault and battery on a police officer are not scorable as crimes of violence in light of Johnson, and, therefore, the total offense level is -- well, the base offense level level is 14 with a four-level enhancement because of the issue with the serial number.

So, to that extent, I think the PSR needs to be changed to reflect that position with the right guideline range.

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. First off, any issue or correction with that? Again, I'll walk through the guidelines more formally, but basically we're down to a guideline range of 57

to 71 months? 1 MR. GARRITY: Judge, as I indicated in the 2. supplemental sentencing memorandum I filed yesterday, Mr. Belin 3 has asked me to take the position that the four-level 4 enhancement for the obliterated serial number does not apply 6 because it was not alleged in the indictment and not proven to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Let me, putting that to one side 8 9 for just a moment, does he have any other corrections or 02:05PM 10 objections to the PSR? 11 MR. GARRITY: He does, Judge. In paragraph 9, he's 12 asked me to object to the language in paragraph 9. It's on the 13 fourth line of that paragraph. That indicates he quickly 14 walked down Mildred Avenue. He objects to that. 15 THE COURT: It's not going to affect his sentence, that difference, and, obviously, this is the government's 16 17 version of the offense as edited by probation, so I note the objection, but I'm going to leave the report as it is in that 18 19 regard. 02:06PM 20 MR. GARRITY: Judge, he's got another. THE COURT: Yes. 21 22 MR. GARRITY: In paragraph 11. 23 THE COURT: Yes. 24 MR. GARRITY: He objects to the entire paragraph. 25 He's asked me to object to the entire paragraph.

1 THE COURT: All right. Again, that may relate to the issue of the legality of the search, but that's not going to 2 affect the sentencing calculus in any way, so, again, I will 3 note the objection, but I'll leave the report as is. 4 5 MR. GARRITY: Thank you. Judge, in paragraph 12, again, he's asked me to object. That's in the second sentence. 7 It begins with, "In response, Belin immediately reached to his waist with both hands." He's asked me to object to that. 8 9 THE COURT: Same ruling in that regard. 02:07PM 10 MR. GARRITY: Again, he objects to the four-level 11 enhancement. 12 THE COURT: All right. Let's talk about the 13 four-level enhancement. Let me find my copy of the guidelines 14 here. What's the guideline provision? 1.5 MR. WORTMANN: I believe it's 2K2.1, your Honor, and I 16 believe it's --17 MR. GARRITY: It's 2K2.1(b)(4). THE COURT: Yes, okay. All right. Mr. Garrity. 18 19 MR. GARRITY: Judge, just before I begin my argument, 02:08PM 20 Mr. Belin has asked me to present another argument that I would 21 just say to the Court I can't in good faith present because I 22 don't think it's an accurate reading of the guidelines, but, 23 nevertheless, he's asked me to present it. 24 But with respect to the objection I laid out in my supplemental sentencing memorandum, he would object to the 25

enhancement being applied because it was not alleged in the indictment and not proven to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt, and I would submit as a matter of constitutional law with respect to the Sixth Amendment that he's entitled to have that alleged and proved.

I guess I acknowledge that Alleyne didn't go quite that far, but I think there's some hints in some of the case law subsequent to Apprendi that eventually the Court might go that way, but, as a constitutional matter, he's asked me to present that argument.

In addition, it is the government's burden with respect to that enhancement. I'm not sure that they've presented sufficient evidence at this hearing with respect to whether or not the serial number was obliterated, or I just want to make sure I've got the correct language, Judge, altered or obliterated.

THE COURT: All right. As to the Constitutional Sixth Amendment argument, I overrule the objection. You're correct, the case law does not go so far. Again, we're talking about a quideline enhancement here, but I will overrule the objection.

Mr. Wortmann, do you want to respond as to whether the facts support the application of the enhancement?

MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, you know, the objection here is a little bit late because had it been made in a timely fashion, I wouldn't have the gun here. Once again, the gun was

02:09РМ 10

2.

1.5

02:09PM 20

1 before the Court. I produced photographs that showed that the serial number had been obliterated. 2. THE COURT: And the PSR says that as well. 3 MR. WORTMANN: And the PSR says that as well. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. That objection is overruled as well. 6 MR. GARRITY: Judge, he's got one further objection to the enhancement that he's asked me to point out to the Court. 8 9 Mr. Belin believes that due to the application note, which is 02:10PM 10 application note 8, he believes that that enhancement only 11 applies to people convicted of offenses that can be found under 12 2K2.1(b)(7) --(a)(7), Judge. 1.3 THE COURT: (A)(7), all right. 14 MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, if you read the plain 15 language of 2K2.1(b)(4) says, "If any firearm had an 16 obliterated serial -- had an altered or obliterated serial 17 number increased by four levels, the plain language of that quideline provision controls," and the law is pretty clear that 18 19 the four-level enhancement applies any time that the gun that's 02:12PM 20 charged in the offense of conviction has an obliterated or 21 altered serial number. 22 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to overrule that 23 objection as well. 24 MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, if I could. 25 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WORTMANN: Forgive me, if I could just comment on one of the objections, and that is the objection with respect to paragraph 12 of the PSR.

THE COURT: Yes.

2.

1.5

02:13PM 20

02:12PM 10

MR. WORTMANN: While that is not technically an issue for a guideline, it is one of the things, the resistance and the movement that Mr. Belin made towards his waist is one of the issues that I believe is relevant at determining whether or not a nonguideline sentence is warranted, and I would simply ask the Court to rely on its own memory of the trial testimony of Officer Bissonnette and the other arresting officers about the nature of Mr. Belin's resistance when he was first approached near the electrical box in the park, and I think Officer Bissonnette's testimony, in particular, my memory it was pretty clear that, you know, he started moving, Mr. Belin started moving his hands towards his waist, and they were afraid that he was going to the gun, and, of course, the offense conduct is also clear that the gun was both fully loaded and had a round in the chamber.

THE COURT: All right. It seems to me there are two different issues there. The reasonableness of the officer's reaction is one thing and goes to the reasonableness of the search or the frisk.

What Mr. Belin was intending is something different. I don't think that I have a sufficient factual basis to

1 conclude that Mr. Belin was reaching for a weapon in order to use or threaten police officers at the time of the stop. 2. The issue is -- with respect, your 3 MR. WORTMANN: Honor, the issue is not one of intent but rather of reckless 4 endangerment, and while when I --THE COURT: Well, he had the gun on him, it was loaded, fine, and I've already ruled I thought the police 7 officers acted reasonably within the meaning of the Fourth 8 9 Amendment. I'm not sure I can take it any farther than that in 02:14PM 10 terms of, you know, whether he was prepared to use it against 11 the officers or threaten it against the officers. MR. WORTMANN: And it's really, you know, I think here 12 1.3 it's the fact that the gun had a round in the chamber, the fact 14 that he resisted that created the risk of harm to both the 1.5 officers, himself and other people in the area. 16 THE COURT: That I think is fair argument. Let's go 17 back. All right. In terms of the PSR, I've indicated that it needs to be corrected to reflect the government's position on 18 19 Johnson. I've overruled the defendant's other objections. 02:14PM 20 Are there any other objections that I need to rule on 21 before we go any further with regard to the PSR, Mr. Garrity? 22 MR. GARRITY: No, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Wortmann? 24 MR. WORTMANN: Thank you, no. 25 THE COURT: All right. So with that, the base offense

level rather than being 24 is 14. I will apply the four-level 1 enhancement. That brings us to a level 18. His criminal 2. history score is 15, his criminal history category is VI. 3 produces a guideline range of 57 to 71 months, a supervised 4 release range of one to three years, a fine range of \$6,000 to 6 \$60,000 and a \$100 special assessment. Is there any correction to that calculation? MR. WORTMANN: No, your Honor. 8 9 MR. GARRITY: No, your Honor. 02:15PM 10 THE COURT: Okay. All right. With that then as our 11 starting point, and, Mr. Garrity, remind me, how long has the 12 defendant been in custody? 1.3 MR. GARRITY: Judge, there was a period of time where 14 he was held on a state charge related to this, and then there 1.5 was a probation violation that he was held on. I would argue that was related to this because the violation was based on 16 this offense, so he's been held since September of 2012. 17 18 THE COURT: September, 2012 is on state custody? 19 MR. GARRITY: He came into federal custody, I believe. 02:16PM 20 THE COURT: October 9th, 2013 is what I have. 21 MR. GARRITY: That's correct, your Honor, but I 22 believe Bureau of Prison will give him credit for the time held 23 on the related charge, and I submit he should be given credit for the probation violation as well because it's all 24

intermingled with the offense conduct.

MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, in fact, had Mr. Belin been revoked and a probationary revocation sentence imposed, then he would not be entitled, but because, as indicated in the PSR, because even though he was on probation for this earlier gun offense, that probation violation was ultimately dismissed, and he was sent over here, therefore, I believe that the Bureau of Prisons will give him credit going all the way back to September.

THE COURT: September, 2012?

MR. WORTMANN: September 17th, 2012.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. With that as our starting point, Mr. Wortmann, let me hear the government's recommendation.

MR. WORTMANN: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, you have a lot of paper in front of you, I apologize to the point that the sentencing memorandum was repetitive, but I frankly wasn't sure how much to do, so I included it.

I'm asking you for an 84-month sentence, which is approximately 13 months over the high end of the guideline range that you've calculated, and it's based on some very basic and very simple things.

One is the seriousness of firearm offenses in this district and both in *Politano* and *Diaz-Rio*, the First Circuit has recognized that gun offenses can be held, can be recognized by the District Court to be particularly serious, and on that

02:17PM 10

2.

02:17PM 20

basis alone, a departure from the guidelines is appropriate.

I've given your Honor some of the things, some excerpts of the things that you read in the newspapers every day, some particular incidents of late in these neighborhoods because, as the research makes clear, it's small sections of Roxbury, Dorchester and Mattapan that are subjected to these gun offenses.

Back several years ago, the Kennedy School did a study of where the gun offenses, the shootings happened in the City of Boston over a 20-year period. They found that 5 percent of the shootings happened in 78 percent of the city, and nearly 80 percent of the city had never had a single shooting, and Norfolk Park, as you heard originally at the detention hearing, and the area around where the incident happened are several blocks away from where Mr. Belin's 2009 car stop, when he had another gun and another weapon in his car along with his son, is in the center of one of those areas.

That by itself justifies the increase over the guideline range, but here, you know, I ask the Court to look carefully at the specific circumstances leading up to the arrest and the seizure of the firearm from Mr. Belin.

The fact that he had additional ammunition, your

Honor, in that Newport cigarette package, and, you know, at

least one District Court Judge, as I had indicated in both the

memos, had found something. You know, if you have extra

02:18PM 10

2.

02:19РМ 20

ammunition, it's further indication that the gun is going to be used.

The fact that he had been shot in May of 2012, along with one of his friends, you know, and the traditional retaliatory nature of the shooting in Boston just says that this is a more serious case than the run-of-the-mill gun felon in possession case.

The fact that he had marijuana on him, no evidence that there was distribution, otherwise he would have been subject to a four-level, therefore, the only thing that we could conclude is that it was for personal use, the only logical, reasonable, and whether he had already smoked or he was planning to smoke, that combination of marijuana and a loaded firearm just makes the case more serious because it makes it more likely that who has ever got the gun is going to make bad judgments.

And the record is replete, your Honor, with Mr. Belin making bad judgments. The location, you know, it's not just that it was the center of gang activity, but it's the fact that this is a park where children and their parents play every day, and if you recall the photographs that were introduced at trial and testimony at trial, that electrical box where the stop was actually made was literally, you could reach over to the tot lot, and people were playing there.

That, again, makes it more serious, as does the fact

02:20PM 10

2.

02:20PM 20

2.

7

9

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:22PM 20

02:21PM 10

that the manner in which he resisted the officer's attempts to secure and subdue him. You know, I don't think three cops had to come in in order to get him under control. You know, that's a fact that you heard in the trial, the fact that that gun was in the waistband, the fact that that gun had a round in the chamber, you know, it increased it, you know, whether or not within the meaning of *United States vs. Bell*, it would qualify as reckless endangerment.

I didn't seek that enhancement because originally he was an ACC, and it didn't apply, but the loss surrounding 3(c)1.2 and Bell can be found, your Honor, at 953 F.2d 6 talks about the mere hesitation when ordered to the ground when you have a gun is not sufficient to constitute reckless endangerment, but it says that actually making a move towards the gun might be, and I'm not asking you to do a specific upward adjustment because we didn't do it in response to the original PSR, but I do think, your Honor, that the way in which Mr. Belin reacted, the fact that that gun was loaded with a round in the chamber makes this a more serious case, and, finally, the thing that makes it a more serious case is the fact that he previously had been arrested for another firearm by the same officer a couple blocks away, and as the offense conduct and as the reports attached to the supplemental memorandum make clear, there is an additional weapon in that car, there was a holster in that car, and his infant son was in

2.

1.3

02:23PM 20

02:23PM 10

the car in the back seat, all of which makes it more serious, as does Mr. Belin's criminal history.

Counsel says, oh, his criminal history is overstated, and I suggest, your Honor, it's quite the opposite. If you look at the PSR, he's been under continuous judicial criminal justice supervision for almost 11 years.

During that time, he's got 20 convictions, that he's been convicted of 20 charges, he's been sentenced seven times. He's been violated probation six times, and at the time of the offense here, as I've indicated, he was on probation for another gun offense, and he was also on pretrial release on another automobile offense.

All of those things make this a more serious case than the typical gun case, which is a serious case in this district and one that for purposes of all of the provisions of 3553, but particularly special and general deterrence, you know, is really critical, and that is, you know, letting Mr. Belin know, letting the four gentlemen that he was with that day know, all the people that, you know, from that area in the city know that if you get caught with a gun, everybody is going to consider it to be a serious case.

Now, there's a couple of mitigation factors that are argued. There's did Mr. Belin -- he's got mental health issues. We know that. I've never seen the report, but I recognize that from the provisions of the pre-sentence report.

2.

02:25PM 20

02:24PM 10

He did not have a terrific upbringing. He had some problems in school, and here's the issue, Judge. Every one of those things I recognize. Every one of those things with any defendant has a tendency to make them less culpable for their crimes, but at the same time, if you look at the same literature, it also makes them more dangerous, and as the Supreme Court recognized in *Pinholster* with respect to mental health issues that it's impossible to figure out how to balance those.

At least in the absence of a very specific and very detailed report that says that this particular kind of mental health, you know, can be dealt with and is not going to cause him to be more dangerous and more likely to recidivate when he gets out. All those things, your Honor, when I put them together in the government's view fully justifies a sentence of 84 months.

In addition, your Honor, I don't believe there's any basis for a fine. I'm asking for a \$100 mandatory special assessment, a final order of forfeiture both with respect to the charged firearm and the charged ammunition and three judicial recommendations because, you know, if Mr. Belin's future is going to be better than his life up until today, we have to start worrying about what the system can do to help him because the sentences are only going to get longer, and the danger to him, he's been shot once already, is only going to increase.

2.

1.5

02:27PM 20

02:26PM 10

A recommendation for any mental health treatment that's available for any alcohol abuse, any treatment regarding alcohol, because as I read the PSR, even though he was a regular smoker of marijuana, it really appears that alcohol was the biggest problem and any vocational training.

On supervised release, your Honor, I'd ask for, 1, that while he's on supervised release he be prohibited from drinking alcohol whatsoever, that your Honor require that he not associate with the individuals that were included on the associational restriction, which is, quite frankly, when I drafted it, it was on the assumption that this was going to be at least a 15-year sentence, and, therefore, I narrowed it, and, obviously, I'll stick to that.

Three of the four individuals that was with him, the fourth had no gang experience. People who he's been FIO'd with, people who's been involved with incident reports and other individuals from this area of the city that have federal convictions, that for the first year of when he's out, when he finishes with the BOP custody, when he's not in a halfway house that he be given a 9 p.m. to 7 a.m. curfew to be enforced by electronic monitoring because the first 12 months is always the most significant and also the most likely.

All the literature tells us when someone is going to get into trouble, if we can keep him, you know, inside in the evening and early morning hours when a great percentage of the

crimes occur in the City of Boston, it only helps him and helps the community, that he be provided with substance abuse treatment as probation considers it to be necessary or appropriate, mental health counseling, the same thing, drug testing up to 104 tests per year, a recommendation to restart and a requirement, the MRT.

On the supplemental memorandum, your Honor, I added a relatively narrow geographic restriction for the area around Norfolk Park. That's the area where both his gun offenses took place. It's an area where a lot of the guys he hangs out with live. It will not interfere with him, assuming that otherwise he be entitled to live in his mother's residence, and that remains the same. It will not restrict that, but it will help him to stay away from situations and people and places where he is more likely to encounter risks and the opportunities to make bad decisions.

THE COURT: Let me interject there. On the proposed geographic restriction, I think there may be a street name missing from your map.

MR. WORTMANN: My apologies.

THE COURT: It's not clear, it goes Talbert Avenue,
I'm going clockwise, Dorchester Avenue.

MR. WORTMANN: Right. Then it says Dot Avenue.

THE COURT: Dot Avenue, it's same thing, then you say

Morton Street, which I think if you look at the bottom of the

18

1

2.

3

4

6

8

9

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

19

02:28PM 10

02:28PM 20

21

23

22

map, Morton Street actually angles down. It looks like there's
a street between Morton and Dorchester.

MR. WORTMANN: I think there is, and I'll be happy to correct that, your Honor, my apologies.

THE COURT: All right. Then on up to Blue Hill Ave. and back over. I don't know what the name of that street is, but I don't think it's Morton Street.

MR. WORTMANN: No, I think you're exactly right, and I do apologize for that, but if your Honor is inclined to allow that, I will provide you and counsel with a corrected one this afternoon.

THE COURT: All right.

3

4

02:29PM 10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:30PM 20

MR. WORTMANN: Unless your Honor has any questions...

THE COURT: Let me hear from Mr. Garrity.

MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, as Mr. Wortmann talked about, I think he minimizes to some extent, Mr. Belin's upbringing was chaotic. I think the PSR lays it out in some detail, but I think the reality is, like a number of children, he didn't have a father figure. I think his father or a person he considered to be his father was incarcerated, and he really didn't have a whole lot of contact with that individual.

According to his mother, he was doing well up until I think seventh grade, was a good student. That's when things went off the rail, and I think it's pretty evident from the PSR and from everything else I've seen that's when the mental

2.

1.5

02:31PM 20

02:31PM 10

health issues really kicked in. He got a little counseling, according to the PSR, around the age of 11. I think he had counseling for about a year, year and a half, but from what I have seen, it doesn't appear he got any intensive, long-term treatment that I think is clear he really needs, and I think those mental health issues led him to self-medicate by way of marijuana, by way of alcohol and led him into a number of the issues that I would submit overinflated his criminal history category.

He was a young individual, still is relatively young, but when he admitted a lot of these crimes that drove up his criminal history score, he was either a teenager in his early 20's, an individual with mental health issues without a strong father figure with a pretty chaotic background thrown into the midst of what I think the government realistically describes as kind of somewhat a war zone, but despite that and despite all of the police reports the government submitted to you, there's no indication whatsoever that Mr. Belin ever used a gun, brandished it, shot a gun.

I know Mr. Wortmann talks a lot of about gun violence in Boston, and I don't dispute that whatsoever. I think it's the reality of the situation in Boston, but there's no indication he ever utilized a gun in a violent manner, and I think it could be a fair reading of what's in the PSR in terms of Mr. Belin being a shooting victim, he had the weapon that

day simply as a means of self-defense rather than as an offensive weapon.

1

2.

3

4

7

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

02:33PM 20

02:33PM 10

Judge, I think the 84 months that the government is asking for is over the top. Certainly a message has to be sent to Mr. Belin because of his prior conviction that he can't engage in this sort of conduct again. A message has to be sent to the general public that gun crimes can't be countenance, but I think 37 months is not a light sentence. That's the sentence we're requesting. I think 84 months is just way over the top given the facts of this case.

Mr. Wortmann talked about --

THE COURT: 37 months is effectively time served, isn't it?

MR. GARRITY: It is, your Honor. And he's been warehoused, hasn't received much, if any, counseling while at Plymouth, so the time he spent in jail really hasn't addressed any of the underlying issues, but he'll be under close supervision.

The probation office, if you impose the curfew that Mr. Wortmann has asked for along with the no drinking condition, which we really don't oppose, I think that will also serve to protect the public, so I guess the question is how much is enough in terms of punishment?

There's no indication at all he used that weapon, no indication that he was going to Norfolk Park. He was walking

2.

1.3

1.5

02:35PM 20

02:34PM 10

with these other individuals on the sidewalk towards the park and no indication that was his destination.

I don't dispute that perhaps the way in which he interacted with the officer that he could have handled that better, but I don't think any of this warrants an 84-month sentence. He shouldn't be punished for the violent gun crimes of others, and if I read the government's memorandum correctly and hear what they're saying correctly, they're in effect saying individuals like Mr. Belin who possess guns, that that geographical area per se should get some sort of enhancement.

I don't think that's appropriate, I don't think the guidelines call for that, I don't think the facts of this case call for it. I think that given his background, the fact that many of his crimes of conviction took place when he was a young individual suffering what I say is some pretty severe mental health issues, I think the 37 months is more than enough along with the recommendations I've asked for when he's on supervision, mental health treatment, substance abuse treatment, vocational treatment, I think all of those will address the issues that led Mr. Belin to being before the Court and have led Mr. Belin to being before other courts.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Wortmann, any reply?

MR. WORTMANN: Well, your Honor, what it's all about is possessing the gun. Every shooting starts with one thing, and that's with somebody with a gun in their waistband or in

2.

1.3

02:36PM 20

02:36PM 10

their pocket, and it gives them the opportunity to make bad decisions, and every year 250, 350 people end up being the victims of bad decisions, and, you know, it would be great if we could say well, oh, Johnny Jones, he's going to carry a gun illegally, but he's not going to use it.

You can't make that decision, and in order to change the quality of life in these neighborhoods, we got to get rid of the guns, and that's why general deterrence here is so important and particularly with somebody like Mr. Belin, who did it once, got caught red-handed, got a pretty good sentence from the state court system, and then, you know, literally months after he gets out, he's doing it all over again and doing it in a way that's far more dangerous.

I think 84 months is an extremely appropriate sentence not just because it's a gun case but because it's a gun case that was committed in the way that it was by the person who the defendant has shown himself to be.

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Garrity.

MR. GARRITY: With respect to the general deterrence argument, in reality, I guess, you know, general deterrence only affects those who are going to hear about his sentence and know what his sentence was. His circle of people that he interacts with are going to hear if you give him the sentence I'm asking for that he got double what he got before, and I think a three-year sentence is not a short period of time.

1.3

02:38PM 20

02:37PM 10

That would send the message of general deterrence, and the government submitted to you a number of police reports as exhibits. There's not one piece of paper in there that indicates that Mr. Belin ever engaged in gun violence, and he was a shooting victim. I think there's every reason to believe he had that for self-defense, just as you could reasonably read the evidence that he had it for other purposes, but I think given the fact that none of those reports, none of the prior convictions ever referred to him using a gun, I think there's a good reason to believe he had that gun for self-defense.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Belin, do you wish to address the Court before I impose sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. I just want you to know that I do take responsibility. I take full responsibility for having the gun on me was wrong, I shouldn't have had it, and it was just that I feel I went to trial because I feel as though that I was being treated unfairly as far as what happened on the scene, as far as everything that I went through, going to Devens, everything, as far as everything I went through, and I never got a chance to, you know, plead out to any of my actual guidelines, so that's the reason why I really went to trial because I just wasn't trying to plead out to 15 years.

I felt as though going to trial -- and I was offered a conditional plea. I wanted all my rights to be reserved, not just what was within the conditional plea, and I just want you

to know I take full responsibility for having the gun on me. I always did.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. There are a lot of issues I guess I want to address, and I'll try to go through them one at a time. I guess first I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Wortmann's view of guns and the effect that they've had not just in this city but nationwide.

I certainly believe that people in the city and in the African-American community or the Hispanic community are not entitled to less law enforcement or less vigorous law enforcement than other parts of the state. Guns tend to make the lives of those communities, the people in those communities more miserable.

They don't tend to affect people living in the suburbs, as many of us do, and I think it's a real issue. It needs to be taken seriously, and people who carry firearms illegally or misuse them or use them at all ought to be punished for the behavior.

Having said that, I can't hold Mr. Belin liable for what other persons have done. I have to judge him as an individual. Of course, everything happens in a context, but I can only hold him liable for what he was done, and I should add, as an afterthought, I am not punishing him for going to trial in any way, shape or form.

In terms of the characteristic of the offense that he

02:40PM 20

2.

1.3

02:39PM 10

had extra rounds of ammunition, which made it more likely that he intended to use them, I agree that does make this a more serious case than most, similar types of cases. The marijuana is a bad fact as well in terms of assessing his behavior and assessing the appropriate punishment, as is, of course, the obliterated serial number, although that's taken into account in the guideline calculation.

The location of the offense at a park on the edge of a playground, I take the point. I think there is only so much weight you can put on that. It's a fact of the matter in the city that almost anywhere you are is near something, a playground, a school, a church, a home where children live. It's part of the problem, every time guns are discharged, it seems an innocent person is hit, so it's a point, but I don't put too much weight on it.

I agree that it's a negative fact that he was on or under supervision for another criminal offense, although, again, that's reflected in the guideline calculation. In terms of the defendant's upbringing, I agree with the general proposition, and it cuts across all strata of society, on the one hand, the defendant is not responsible for who his parents are and how he was raised, and his father was incarcerated. That's not his choice or his fault, and, therefore, ought to make him less culpable to some extent.

It's also true that someone raised in that environment

02:41PM 10

2.

02:42PM 20

2.

1.3

1.5

02:44PM 20

02:43PM 10

is more likely to commit more crimes, to repeat the patterns that have already been set. The inverse is true for so-called white collar criminals. You might argue that they're more culpable because they've had many advantages, some of them, and they're less likely to recidivate.

It's hard to know what to do with all of this. I take into account, of course, as I must, the fact that the defendant had a difficult childhood and that he's not responsible, again, for the choices of his parents.

That is a factor that needs to be weighed in the scale here, but he's also an adult who needs to be responsible for his own choices. I do want to add that I have never understood the argument, which has gained quite a bit of currency lately, that it doesn't matter if children, particularly boys, have fathers or not, that there's lots of different alternative families and that we, as a society, are being unfairly judgmental of single mothers or otherwise difficult child-raising circumstances.

I think as a general proposition children are better off with parents, with parents who are home, who are employed and are making their best efforts to raise them. That is to me perfectly obvious and that we ought not to back away from that fact, but, again, Mr. Belin didn't have that choice. He unfortunately is making bad choices for his own children, but I'm not going to give him a shorter or longer sentence based on

that either.

2.

1.3

1.5

02:46PM 20

02:45PM 10

And I apologize, I'm sort of hopping around here to a number of different topics somewhat quickly. It's true that the defendant has spent three years in custody. I'm sure that whether in state custody or federal custody that he has not had an opportunity to participate in the programs that he would have had had he been sentenced earlier to prison. I'm not sure what to say about that. He did go to trial, of course, which was his right.

It does take longer to get a case ready for trial, and he did have the mental health evaluation, which I was requested to order and I did order, and, frankly, the last six months or so have been delays occasioned by the *Johnson* case and related issues, which have worked very much to the defendant's favor.

I think otherwise he would be looking at a quite significant sentence, and so on the whole, I think the defendant has benefited from the delay in sentencing, although I recognize it is harder to do the time in detention rather than in a federal facility as a general proposition, particularly due to the lack of programs.

It does appear to me based on the forensic report that the defendant does have mental health issues. He does, I think, require treatment for that. I'm obviously no expert.

I'm sure it contributes to some extent to his criminal behavior, but, again, it does not make him any less dangerous,

2.

1.3

1.5

02:48PM 20

02:47PM 10

and the defendant's criminal history, you know, whether or not Johnson applies and whether or not he was on probation for another offense is significant.

He has been under some form of criminal justice supervision or incarceration for large chunks of his life. He has been repeatedly in the criminal justice system and has amassed a criminal record that is significant given his relatively short life so far.

He has been able to dodge much more significant consequences because of the Supreme Court's ruling, but the offenses are there, nonetheless. He does have four resisting arrest convictions as well as assault and battery on a police officer.

So, with all of that, I think as I see it, it is an unusual situation to go above the high end of the guidelines. I have done it from time to time. It is and ought to be rare, whether as the matter of the guidelines or under 3553, for cases that have unusual or significant characteristics or attributes or factors that take them out of the heartland.

Even with all the factors pointed out by Mr. Wortmann here, it's not clear to me that I need to go above the high end of the guidelines. I think there is a good argument for it, and Mr. Wortmann has made it, but I think I'm not quite convinced, and what I'm going to do is to sentence at the high end of the guidelines at 71 months but not go beyond it, and I

2.

02:50PM 20

02:49PM 10

do that with some reservations given my obvious concerns about the possibility of the defendant's propensity for violence.

I do think that the curfew, the associational restrictions and the geographic restrictions are appropriate. I know Mr. Wortmann's position because he advocates for this routinely, and I agree with the basic proposition that one of the problems that defendants have is they come out of the system, they come out of prison, and they go back right to the same neighborhood and begin hanging out with the same people doing exactly what they did before they went in, and it's a very easy thing to do to fall back into old patterns and to not really have a chance to get on your feet and to try turning your life in a different direction, whether it's in terms of not only just abiding by the law but also maintaining employment, getting yourself educated, taking care of your children and so on, so I do think those restrictions are appropriate.

Again, they're not intended to punish but to give the defendant a fair chance under the circumstances to again point his life in a different direction from where it's been pointed thus far.

So for all of those reasons, and I'll state the formal reasons in a moment, I am going to sentence him to 71 months in prison. I'm sorry, Mr. Wortmann, did the government -- what was your recommendation of the length of supervised release?

1 MR. WORTMANN: Three years, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Garrity, what's your view of that? 2. MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, that's what I had 3 recommended as well. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. I think that's appropriate as well given all the factors and circumstances presented here. So with that, what I'm going to do is to formally state the 7 sentence I'm going to impose followed by a formal statement of 8 9 the reasons to the extent I haven't done so already, and then 02:51PM 10 I'll give counsel a final opportunity to make any corrections 11 or objections. I'm sorry, Mr. Wortmann, your judicial recommendations 12 13 as opposed to the terms of supervised release, your judicial 14 recommendations were --15 MR. WORTMANN: Mental health counseling, your Honor, access to alcohol counseling and any vocational training that's 16 available while he's incarcerated. 17 18 THE COURT: All right. Did I hear you say Restart as 19 well? 02:52PM 20 MR. WORTMANN: Yes, your Honor, the conditions that I 21 recommended were prohibition on alcohol, the associational and 22 geographic restrictions, the curfew for the first 12 months to 23 be enforced by electronic monitoring, substance abuse and 24 mental health treatment and testing and a recommendation for 25 Restart and a requirement for the MRT Program if it's

considered to be appropriate by probation.

THE COURT: All right. Would the defendant please stand.

MR. GARRITY: I'm sorry, Judge.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, would the defendant please stand. Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 and having considered the sentencing factors set forth at 18

United States Code, Section 3553(a), it is the judgment of the Court that the Defendant King Belin is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 71 months.

The Court makes judicial recommendations that the defendant participate in substance abuse treatment while in Bureau of Prisons' custody, that the defendant participate in mental health counseling while in custody and that the defendant receive appropriate vocational training while in custody.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. Within 72 hours of release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the district to which the defendant is released.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall comply with the following terms and conditions:

The defendant shall not commit another federal, state

2.

1.3

02:53PM 10

02:53PM 20

or local crime and shall not illegally possess a controlled substance.

The defendant shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance.

The defendant shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter, not to exceed 104 tests per year as directed by Probation.

The defendant shall submit to the collection of DNA sample as directed by Probation.

The defendant shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court, which are set forth at 5D1.3C of the Sentencing Guidelines and which will be set forth in detail in the judgment.

The defendant is prohibited from possessing a firearm, destructive device or other dangerous weapon.

The defendant is to refrain from any use of alcohol or alcoholic beverages.

The defendant is to participate in a mental health treatment program as directed by probation.

The defendant shall be required to contribute to the costs of services for such treatment based on the ability to pay or availability of third-party payment.

The defendant shall participate in a program for substance abuse counseling as directed by probation, which

02:54PM 10

1

2.

3

4

5

7

8

9

11

12

1.3

14 15

17

18

16

19

02:54PM 20

23

21

22

24

2.

1.3

02:56PM 20

02:55PM 10

program may include testing, not to exceed 104 drug tests per year to determine whether the defendant has reverted to the use of alcohol or drugs.

The defendant shall be required to contribute to the costs of services for such treatment based on the availability to pay or availability of third-party payment.

The defendant shall participate in educational and/or vocational services programs as directed by Probation. Such programs may include G.E.D. preparation, classes designed to improve his proficiency and skills, including reading, writing, mathematics and computer use, job readiness and skills development training.

Again, he'll be required to contribute to the costs of services for such program based on the ability to pay or the availability of third-party payment.

During the first year while on supervised release, the defendant shall abide by a curfew from 9 p.m. to 7 a.m. each day. The curfew shall be enforced with electronic monitoring. The defendant is not to interfere with the monitoring equipment. The defendant may leave his home between 9 p.m. and 7 a.m. only for medical or other emergencies or with the expressed permission of the probation department in advance.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall not contact or be in the company of the following individuals without the expressed advanced permission of Probation:

Rudy Antenor, Reggie Boyd, Giovanni Cooley, Ellis Golden,

Demarcus Kirkland, Derek Kirkland, Dwan Knight, Corey Mathis,

Jamal Nation, Eric Norman, Kareem Smith, Brian Stokes, Rafael

Wallace or Calvin White.

While on supervised release, the defendant is prohibited from entering a geographic area in the City of Boston bounded by Talbot Avenue, Dorchester Avenue, a street to be identified by the government that runs between Dorchester Avenue and Morton Street, Morton Street and Blue Hill Avenue without the expressed advanced permission of probation.

Nothing in the restrictions shall prohibit the defendant from traveling on those named roads or traveling on any bus or subway operating within that zone provided that he does not get off the bus or get off the train anywhere within the zone, and, obviously, that includes the Orange Line which crosses the zone.

The Court makes a recommendation that the defendant consider and be accepted to the Restart Program and the MRT Program as well, and the Court grants the government's motion for an entry of order of forfeiture, and the forfeiture will be included in the judgment.

It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay the United States a special assessment of \$100, which shall be due immediately.

Do counsel have any addition, correction or objection

02:57PM 10

2.

02:58PM 20

1 to that sentence not previously stated? Mr. Wortmann. MR. WORTMANN: Your Honor, I assume you're ordering no 2. fine because he has no ability to pay? 3 THE COURT: Correct. Mr. Garrity. 4 MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, can I confer? THE COURT: Yes. MR. GARRITY: Judge, Mr. Belin has asked me to object to the curfew as a general matter. 8 9 THE COURT: Yes. MR. GARRITY: But beyond that, just one question. 02:58PM 10 11 know you indicated that he can leave the home between 9 p.m. 12 and 7 a.m. for medical purposes? 1.3 THE COURT: For medical emergencies or other 14 emergencies or with the expressed permission of Probation. 1.5 other words, let's say that he has a program of evening classes and he needs to get home by 10:00. If he makes that 16 17 arrangement with Probation, they approve, he can do it, otherwise 9 p.m. to 7 a.m. curfew. He needs to be at home. 18 19 MR. GARRITY: Is it possible to add in for work 02:59PM 20 purposes or educational purposes as well? 21 THE COURT: Again, that's fine if Probation approves 22 in advance, if he gets a job on a night shift. I mean, there 23 might be different ways that this could play out, but without 24 Probation's permission for legitimate educational employment purposes, training purposes, it's either, you know, permission 25

2.

1.5

03:00PM 20

03:00PM 10

of Probation or medical emergencies, other emergencies, if his house catches file, for example.

MR. GARRITY: Your Honor, Mr. Belin does object as a general matter to the curfew and the electronic monitoring.

THE COURT: All right. That objection is overruled. The sentence is hereby stated. In terms of the formal reasons for the sentence, it is a guideline sentence imposed within the relevant guideline range for the reasons indicated. It is at the high end of the guidelines, again, for the reasons indicated.

The term of supervised release and the various conditions are required to help the defendant adjust to life outside of prison and to ensure adequate supervision. I'm imposing no fine as he's established he's not able and even with the use of a reasonable installment schedule is not likely to become able to pay all or part of the fines required under the guidelines.

All right. Let me give Mr. Belin his advice of rights. Mr. Belin, you can appeal your conviction if you believe that there was some fundamental defect or other error requiring reversal. You have the right to appeal your sentence, particularly if you think the sentence was contrary to law. If you're unable to pay the costs of appeal, you may ask permission to have those costs waived and appeal without any pain.

You must file any notice of appeal within 14 days after the entry of judgment, and if you request, the clerk will immediately prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Before we break, Mr. Belin, I know you're not happy with my ruling on the search, I know you were not happy with the jury's verdict, and I'm sure you're not happy with my sentence.

I do, in fact, wish you well. You've made some serious mistakes, you're paying a heavy price for it. I hope that, for whatever reason, you do turn your life around, that you move your life in a different direction, one that does not involve gun, among other things, but that's obviously entirely up to you.

It's your choice, and there are people who can help you with your issues and your problems, who can give you counseling and training, but at the end of the day, you know, your life is what you make of it. It's entirely up to you. It is your responsibility. You said you take responsibility for having the gun on the street, I appreciate that, and, you know, you need to take responsibility for your life as well and those of your children, for that matter.

All right. Is there anything further, Mr. Wortmann?
MR. WORTMANN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Garrity.

MR. GARRITY: No, your Honor.

03:02PM 20

03:01PM 10

VALERIE A. O'HARA

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24